CENTENARY OF THE
NORWICH MUSEUM

LOAN COLLECTION
of
PICTURES

. . Illustrative of . .
the Evolution of
Painting from the
XVIIth Century to
the Present Day

CENTENARY OF THE NORWICH MUSEUM

LOAN COLLECTION

of

PICTURES

Illustrative of the Evolution of Painting from the XVIIth Century to the Present Day

Under the Auspices of the Norwich Castle Museum Committee

OCTOBER 24TH
TO
NOVEMBER 21ST
1925

N
5056
N89
L79
c.2

CASTLE MUSEUM COMMITTEE.

Ex-officio Members of the Committee:

The Right Hon. THE LORD MAYOR (DR. G. STEVENS POPE), *Chairman.*

Lt.-Com. the Rt. Hon. E. HILTON YOUNG, D.S.O., M.P.

Capt. J. GRIFFYTH FAIRFAX, M.P.

Members of the Council:

Alderman Dr. E. E. BLYTH, J.P.

Alderman H. J. COPEMAN, J.P.

Alderman GRANVILLE DUFF, M.C.

Alderman GEORGE GREEN, J.P.

Alderman J. F. HENDERSON, J.P.

Alderman SIR GEORGE MORSE, J.P., *Vice-Chairman.*

Alderman E. WILD, J.P.

Councillor T. P. CASTLEY.

Councillor Dr. J. FLACK.

Councillor F. JEWSON.

Persons Specially Interested in Science, Literature and Art:

Mr. E. T. BOARDMAN, F.R.I.B.A.

Mr. LEONARD G. BOLINGBROKE.

Mr. GEOFFREY F. BUXTON, C.B.

Mr. RUSSELL J. COLMAN, D.L.

Mr. ROBERT GURNEY, M.A., F.Z.S.

Mr. FRANK C. HINDE.

Mr. H. N. HOLMES.

Mr. ARTHUR M. SAMUEL, M.P., F.R.E.S.

Mr. J. H. F. WALTER, F.Z.S.

ARNOLD H. MILLER, *Town Clerk.* FRANK LENEY, *Curator.*

NOTE

The Norwich Castle Museum Committee resolved that an integral part of the celebrations of the Centenary of the Norwich Museum should be a Loan Collection of Pictures illustrative of the Evolution of Painting from the Seventeenth Century to the Present Day, with special reference to the niche occupied by the " Norwich School."

The suggestion was made by Mr. Percy Moore Turner, and he is responsible for the scheme in its entirety. The Catalogue of the Pictures, with the accompanying notes is evidence of Mr. Turner's intimate knowledge of art, more especially that of the modern school.

The Committee also desire to place on record their grateful thanks to those ladies and gentlemen who have depleted their homes of art treasures in order that a representative collection should be exhibited in the Art Galleries of the City of Norwich.

The difficulties and disappointments entailed in bringing together such a collection could not have been overcome without the encouragement and keen interest evinced by the Right Hon. the Lord Mayor (Dr. G. Stevens Pope) and Mr. Russell J. Colman, of Crown Point.

FRANK LENEY,
Curator.

Norwich Castle Museum,
October, 1925.

PREFACE

By R. R. Tatlock

THE world, as the trivial phrase has it, "is growing smaller," in the sense that the modern contrivances of the scientist continually facilitate human intercourse and our power of comparing with others our experiences and ideas. This is affecting in a particularly subtle way our attitude to art. We are becoming deparochialized.

There was a time when each country, however small, had its own apparently distinct art, and many of those we now celebrate as Old Masters were known during their lifetimes only in their own localities. A few centuries ago a tiny country like Holland contained within itself several apparently distinct schools of paintings. That this remained true even in nineteenth century England will be plain enough to all who realise the remarkable individuality of the old Norwich School.

To-day all that has changed. The work of the youngest painter possessing, according to current opinion, any sort of promise is now quickly made known, through reproductions, etc., to the inhabitants of the entire civilised world. The best French artists are quite familiar in London, the best English artists appear in the exhibition rooms of New York; even Russia and Japan possess magnificent public collections of the work of the most modern artists in Christendom. It is unnecessary to point out that these circumstances are profoundly altering the character of modern art.

The same change has affected not only the artist but the art historian. The days are forever gone when the historian of English art could afford to pass over in silence all artists except those of English nationality. Modern art histories no longer deal separately with the art of each country. It has become as ridiculous to suppose that Constable owed nothing to Flemish art and that French art owed nothing to Constable, as to suppose that Turner or Whistler or Beardsley, or for that matter, Sickert, Steer, or Grant, have lived and moved and had their being only in this country. Sensible artists always have sought and found inspiration

somewhere in foreign art, for one of the confirmed habits of the genuine artist is his habit of considering a work of art for its own sake and without national or any other prejudice. Modern art historians are only now beginning to grasp this, or at any rate to act upon it. Who else has grasped it or acted upon it? Nobody at all. The people responsible for our art exhibitions have hitherto quite failed to do so.

Before London exhibition organisers have awakened to what is going on, the authorities of the Norwich Corporation Art Galleries have quietly brought together a collection of pictures which expresses for the first time in this country the modern view of art history. The aim is to show us, as far as that is possible within the limits of a quite small exhibition, two things :—

(1) The development of European painting from the seventeenth century to the present day.

(2) The enormous influence exercised by certain foreign painters upon certain of England's greatest geniuses.

I am in no position to boast of the achievement, for I am not responsible for the exhibition, and have not at the time of writing seen the pictures hung together, though indeed most of them are old friends. But I know enough of the scheme to feel sure that it is a sound one. It must be borne in mind, however, that there are many possible readings of art history. The particular reading of which this exhibition is an illustration must be judged on its merits and in comparison with other possible readings. It is for visitors to consider that for themselves, to make up their minds whether the inevitable emphases are just and whether the inevitable gaps are expediently distributed. Finally, it is worth hinting that those who cannot be bothered with art history at all can still take pleasure in this excellent collection of pictures, just for its own sake. It is to be hoped that the art historians will not forget, as they too often do, to indulge themselves also in that indispensable pleasure.

The Scheme of the Exhibition

THIS EXHIBITION has been organized with a view of showing the development of painting from the middle of the seventeenth century onwards. For that purpose the period has been divided into eleven sections, and each section is provided with a panel of representative painters, whose works are placed together, that they may be studied, not only in themselves, but in connexion with those who came before and those who followed after. This mode of arranging an exhibition of pictures is, it is believed, original and now practised for the first time. The place taken by Crome and Cotman, the leaders of the Norwich School, will be appreciated by all Norwich men; that alone would justify such an exhibition on an occasion of such peculiar interests to this great city. One point in the selection of the works here shown was a matter of serious consideration, the desirability of including living painters. There is much to be said against this; distance of time is necessary for a final appreciation of the place held in the history of art by any painter. The definite lead, however, given to recent painting by Cézanne has been so important that it was felt that he and the men influenced by him could not be omitted; hence the appearance of their works in this exhibition.

The foundations of modern European painting must be looked for in the works of certain seventeenth century painters—Rubens, Rembrandt, Velasquez, El Greco, Claude Lorrain, Ruisdael, Cuyp, and Hobbema—in which were summed up such part of the great traditions of the older masters as was adaptable to later painting. Works of certain of these masters are here shown :—

PANEL I.

RUBENS	RUISDAEL
CLAUDE	HOBBEMA
	CUYP

In the eighteenth century the art of painting deserted the Low Countries for France and England.

PANEL II.

Watteau	Hogarth
Chardin	Wilson
Fragonard	Gainsborough
	Reynolds

The French Revolution arrested French development, but that of the English painters progressed, and it was largely through their influence that French painting in time recovered itself.

PANEL III.

Crome	Constable
Cotman	Bonington

The direct influence of the English painters represented in the third panel led to the French School of 1830, sometimes called the Barbizon School.

PANEL IV.

Corot	Daubigny
Millet	Rousseau

Meantime the classical movement produced one great man—Ingres. Going to the Florentines for inspiration, he produced work, which, for purity of line, was unrivalled in his own day and has never been surpassed since. There was a revolt against the classical school headed by Delacroix, who founded another, the Romantic. The struggle between the two schools was severe. Ingres led the one, Delacroix the other. The English painter, J. M. W. Turner was also a Romanticist.

PANEL V.

Ingres	Delacroix
	Turner

The Romantic temperament was exuberant and restraint became necessary ; that was supplied by Courbet and Daumier. About the same time French art was further influenced by the grafting of the Dutch tradition upon it by Jongkind.

PANEL VI.

Courbet	Jongkind
Daumier	

The attempts of some nineteenth century painters to show the effect of light and generally to bring painting into closer relations with science gave rise to the Impressionist movement.

PANEL VII.

MANET
MONET
SISLEY
DEGAS
SICKERT
STEER

Then came the Neo-Impressionists, who pushed the Impressionist methods to their logical conclusion.

PANEL VIII.

SEURAT
SIGNAC

Next came the transition from Impressionism to Post-Impressionism.

PANEL IX.

RENOIR.

Revolt against the impressionist theories was inevitable ; painting was in danger of becoming too objective. The leaders of the new movement are here represented.

PANEL X.

CÉZANNE
VAN GOGH
GAUGUIN

The influence of Cézanne was great upon the younger generation. Those so influenced, however, cannot be grouped under one label ; not all are post-impressionist, some, such as Bonnard and Vuillard, are to a great extent impressionists. All, however, here represented are typical of present-day tendencies.

PANEL XI.

BONNARD
DERAIN
FRIESZ
GRANT
MARCHAND
MATISSE
PORTER
SEGONZAC
VUILLARD

These notes are necessarily brief and inadequate, but those interested will find others at the end of the catalogue in which the story of the development is dealt with at greater length.

CATALOGUE OF PICTURES

PANEL I.

Claude Lorrain (1600—1682).

1 "Apollo Flaying Marsias" ... ... 45″ × 60½″

Old Masters Exhibition, Burlington House, 1879 & 1902.

Lent by the Right Hon. the Earl of Leicester.

Meindert Hobbema (1638—1709).

2 Landscape with Water Mill ... ... 26″ × 31½″

Lent by the Most Hon. the Marquess of Bute.

Jacob Isaaczon Ruisdael (1628—1682).

3 Landscape with Distant View of a Castle ... ... 21½ × 27″

(see illustration)

Lent by Mr. A. F. Reyre.

Sir Peter Paul Rubens (1577—1640).

4 Portrait of the Archduke Albert, Governor of the Netherlands ... ... 30½″ × 22¼″

(see illustration)

The original portrait painted entirely by the hand of Rubens in 1609, upon his return from Italy. From this portrait the numerous replicas and copies which were distributed over Europe were painted (vide Max Rooses). From the Bernal Collection.

Lent by Mr. Percy Moore Turner.

School of Rubens.

5 A Holy Family, with Saint George, and Other Saints ... 49″ × 64″

Purchased with the Angerstein Collection in 1824. Considered by Max Rooses to be in large part the work of Rubens' scholars and the Landscape by Van Uden.

Lent by the Trustees of the National Gallery.

Sir Peter Paul Rubens

PORTRAIT OF ARCHDUKE ALBERT
GOVERNOR OF THE NETHERLANDS
(No. 4 in Catalogue)

A. Cuyp.

6 "River Scene with Cattle" ... ... 18″ × 29″

De Groot's Catal., No. 391. Formerly in the possession of Mr. Joseph Barchard (1822), and in Sir R. Peel's collection before 1834. Peel Collection in 1871.

Lent by the Trustees of the National Gallery.

PANEL II.

Jean Antoine Watteau (1683—1721).

7 "Two Figures Seated in a Garden" ... ... 7½″ × 4¾″

From the Taunton Collection and the Collection of E. A. V. Stanley, Mantock Lodge, Bridgwater. Referred to in Waagen's Art Treasures, Vol. 2, p. 422.

Lent by Mrs. F. J. Weldon.

Jean Baptiste Simeon Chardin (1699—1779).

8 "Une Dame Prenant son Thé" ... ... 30½″ × 38″

Signed and dated 1735. Exhibited by Chardin at the Salon, 1739.

Lent by the Glasgow University Court.

9 "Still Life" (signed) ... ... 12½″ by 15½″

Lent by Mrs. F. J. Weldon.

Jean Honoré Fragonard (1732—1806).

10 "Le Vœu a l'Amour" ... ... 17¾″ × 16½″

From the Walferden and Audeoud Collections, No. 291a Louvre Catalogue.

Lent by the Louvre, Paris.

William Hogarth (1697—1764).

11 "Portrait of the Hon. Edward Montagu" (younger son of the 4th Earl of Sandwich) ... ... 20¾″ × 16¾″

Exhibited at the Royal Academy Winter Exhibition, 1906, Japan-British Exhibition, 1910.

Lent by the Right Hon. the Earl of Sandwich.

Jacob Ruisdael

LANDSCAPE

(*No. 3 in Catalogue*)

Richard Wilson, R.A. (1714—1782).

12 Landscape—Evening ... ... 14″ × 24½″

From the Collection of Sir George Beaumont, Bart.

Lent by Captain Richard Ford.

13 "Solitude" ... ... 28″ × 34″

Engraved by Wm. Woollett.

Lent by Mr. E. A. Lewis.

Thomas Gainsborough, R.A. (1727—1788).

14 Portrait of the Artist, by Himself (see illustration) 29¾″ × 24½″

This portrait is mentioned by Sir Walter Armstrong in his "Gainsborough and his place in English Art." It was exhibited at Leeds in 1868, and the Grosvenor Gallery in 1885. It has been engraved in stipple by F. Bartolozzi and Henry Meyer.

Old Masters Exhibition, Burlington House, 1879.

Lent by the Right Hon. the Earl of Leicester.

15 Portrait of Mr. Plampin ... ... 19″ × 23½″

Described in Sir Walter Armstrong's "Gainsborough and his place in English Art," pages 276 and 827, and reproduced on plate facing page 152 of the same work.

Lent by Mr. F. Hindley Smith.

16 "The Edge of the Common" ... ... 25″ × 30″

From the Fuller Collection. Catalogued by Sir Walter Armstrong in his "Gainsborough," page 205, and in the same author's "Gainsborough and his place in English Art," page 283.

Lent by Mr. E. A. Lewis.

17 Romantic Landscape ... ... 47″ × 58″

Exhibited, Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 1924; English Masters, New York, 1925.

Lent by Mr. Victor Rienaecker.

Thos. Gainsborough

PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST

(*No.* 14 *in Catalogue*)

Sir Joshua Reynolds, P.R.A. (1723—1792).

18 Portrait of Charles James Fox (1749—1806) ... 50″ × 40″

Bequeathed to Mr. T. W. Coke (afterwards first Earl of Leicester of the second creation) by John, first Baron Crewe (of the second creation) in 1829. Sir Walter Armstrong, in his work on Sir Joshua, states that this portrait was painted and exhibited in the Royal Academy the same year as " The Tragic Muse," 1784 ; and, further, says " the Portrait of Fox shows Sir Joshua at his best, and may fairly be put with the Lord Heathfield of the National Gallery."

The Fox was on Sir Joshua's easel when the Coalition Ministry fell in December, 1783, and the painter had some delicacy in carrying out one of the sitter's requests. Fox had wished his India Bill, the cause of his expulsion from office, to be introduced. Reynolds hesitated to perpetuate a failure, but Fox stuck to his guns and those who see the picture may still read upon it " A Bill for the better regulating of the affairs of the E.I. Company."

Exhibited Old Masters, Burlington House, 1879.

Lent by the Right Hon. the Earl of Leicester.

PANEL III.

John Crome (1768—1821).

19 An early study of Norwich from the Mousehold Gravel Pits $21\frac{7}{8}$″ × $17\frac{3}{8}$″

An early study in the style of Wilson, Exhibited Crome Centenary Exhibition, Norwich, 1921.

Lent by Mr. J. R. Nutman.

20 " Water Mill " ... ... $23\frac{1}{2}$″ × $27\frac{1}{2}$″

Exhibited Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, 1924 ; English Masters, New York, 1925 ; Royal Society, British Artists, 1923.

Lent by Mr. Victor Rienaecker.

21 " Early Dawn " ... ... $12\frac{3}{4}$″ × 11″

Exhibited Crome Centenary Exhibition, Norwich, 1921.

Lent by Mr. Russell J. Colman.

22 " Postwick Grove " ... ... $18\frac{3}{4}$″ × $15\frac{1}{2}$″

Exhibited Crome Centenary Exhibition, Norwich, 1921.

Lent by Mr. Russell J. Colman.

John Sell Cotman

"THE WINDMILLS"

(No. 26 in Catalogue)

23 "The Road with Pollards" ... ... 28″ × 42″

This picture formerly belonged to Mr. B. Sherrington, the well-known collector of Crome's works. He bequeathed it to his friend W. H. Hunt, of Yarmouth, who first exhibited it in 1856 at the Exhibition of the Norfolk and Norwich Association for the Promotion of the Fine Arts in the rooms in St. Andrew's Broad Street, Norwich, No. 225 in catalogue. In 1862 he exhibited it at the International Exhibition. A few years after this, Hunt was compelled to sell it by Auction, when at Mr. Colman's request Mr. James King went to the sale at Yarmouth and bought the picture for £100. It was exhibited at the Exhibition of Old Masters at the Royal Academy in 1878, No. 39 in catalogue, and has been reproduced by the Autotype Company.

Exhibited Crome Centenary Exhibition, Norwich, 1921.

Lent by Mr. Russell J. Colman.

JOHN SELL COTMAN (1782—1842).

24 "The Waterfall" ... ... 22″ × 17″

This picture was given by the Artist to William Kinnebrook, whose widow eventually disposed of it to J. B. Ladbroke for a few shillings. It subsequently passed into the hands of John Wigger, picture dealer, who sold it to William Dixon. At Dixon's sale at the Bazaar Rooms, May 17th, 1882, it was bought by Mr. Colman for fifty-four guineas. Exhibited by Mr. Colman at the Winter Exhibition of Old Masters at the Royal Academy, 1894. Exhibited by Mr. Colman at the British Empire Exhibition, 1924. Reproduced in Mr. Adrian Stokes' book on Landscape Painting, 1924. Cotman Exhibition, National Gallery, Millbank, 1922. British Empire Exhibition, 1924.

Lent by Mr. Russell J. Colman.

25 "The Drop Gate" ... ... 13″ × 10″

Ex. Coll. Rev. J. M. Johnson, R. S. Tait, Frederick Roe. Exh. R.A. 1896.

Cotman Exhibition, National Gallery, Millbank, 1922, No. 114.

Lent by the Trustees of the National Gallery of British Art.

26 "The Windmills" ... ... $20\frac{3}{4}$″ × $35\frac{1}{4}$″

In the owner's family since it was painted by the Artist.
(See illustration)

Cotman Exhibition, National Gallery, Millbank, 1922.

Lent by Mr. J. A. Christie, M.P.

JOHN CONSTABLE, R.A. (1776—1837).

27 "Hampstead Heath" ... ... 17¼" × 23¼"

Lent by Sir Michael Sadler, C.B.

28 "Keswick Lake" ... ... 9¼" × 16¼"

Painted 1806, Exhibited R.A. 1807, Exhibited British Institution, 1809.

Lent by Sir Charles Holmes.

29 "The Glebe Farm" ... ... 23" × 31"

Painted about 1827, Exhibited at Leeds 1868 (No. 1232), Exhibited at Burlington House (Old Masters) 1886 (No. 30), Henry Vaughan Bequest 1900.

Lent by the Trustees of the National Gallery of British Art.

RICHARD PARKES BONINGTON (1801—1828).

30 "Low Tide on the French Coast" ... ... 16½" × 21"

Exhibited at the Old Masters Exhibition, Burlington House, 1891. Purchased from the Artist by Sir George Warrender, Bart. Afterwards in the collection of the Marquis Maison, from whom it was acquired by Henry McConnel, Esq., of Cressbrook, Derbyshire. From the McConnel Collection.

Lent by the Right Hon. Lord Glenconner.

PANEL IV.

JEAN BAPTISTE CAMILLE COROT (1796—1875).

31 "Les Bords du Tibre encaisses par les Collines" ... 10⅜" × 15⅛"

Cited in Robant "*L'oeuvre de Corot*," and reproduced.

Lent by Mr. Victor Rienaecker.

32 "Montagnes de Limousin" ... ... 6¾" × 11¼"

Stamp of the Corot Sale. From the Collection of Fantin-Latour. Described and illustrated in "*L'œuvre de Corot*" by Robant, Vol. 2, page 549, and in Vol. 4, page 238.

Lent by Mr. S. W. Sykes.

33 "Le Pêcheur" ... ... $8\frac{3}{8}'' \times 13''$

Ex. Collection F. Dechamps (Regent de la Banque de France)

Lent by Mr. Victor Rienaecker.

JEAN FRANÇOIS MILLET (1814—1875).

34 "Going to Work" ... ... $21'' \times 17''$

Inaugural Loan Exhibition, Kirkcaldy, 1925.

Lent by Kelvingrove Art Galleries, Glasgow.

CHARLES FRANÇOIS DAUBIGNY (1817—1878).

35 "L'Etang de Corbigny" ... ... $12'' \times 29''$

From the Collection of James Milne ; engraved by Boussod Valadon.

Lent by Mr. Victor Rienaecker.

36 "Autumn—Moonrise," ... ... $18\frac{3}{4}'' \times 30\frac{3}{4}''$

From the Collection of Eugene Pell.

Lent by Mr. Percy Moore Turner.

PIERRE ETIENNE THEODORE ROUSSEAU (1812—1867).

37 "Soleil Couchant" ... ... $5\frac{1}{2}'' \times 3\frac{1}{2}''$

Originally given by Rousseau to Francastel, Ex. Collection Right Hon. Sir J. C. Day.

Lent by Mr. Victor Rienaecker.

PANEL V.

JEAN AUGUSTE DOMINIQUE INGRES (1780—1867).

38 Model for Ste Germaine de Pibrae ... $12\frac{7}{8}'' \times 10''$

From the Beurdeley Collection.

Lent by Mr. Oswald Falk.

EUGENE DELACROIX (1798—1863)

39 "Ovide chez les Scythes" ... ... $19'' \times 2\frac{1}{4}''$

Signed and dated 1862

Lent by M. M. Bernheim-Jeune.

JOSEPH MALLORD WILLIAM TURNER (1775—1851).

40 "The Fight on the Bridge" ... ... $16\frac{1}{4}'' \times 23\frac{1}{2}''$
Signed and dated 1814. From the Collection of Sir Charles Robinson.
Lent by Mr. E. Hockliffe.

41 "The Burning of the Ships" ... ... $34\frac{1}{2}'' \times 46\frac{1}{4}''$
Painted about 1840.
Lent by the Trustees of the National Gallery of British Art.

PANEL VI.

GUSTAVE COURBET (1819—1877).

42 "Snow Scene" ... ... $19'' \times 23\frac{1}{2}''$
Signed. From the Collection of the Prince de Wagram.
Lent by Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Maitland.

HONORÉ DAUMIER (1808—1879).

43 "La Serenade" ... ... $11\frac{1}{2}'' \times 15\frac{1}{4}''$
Lent by Sir Michael Sadler, C.B.

JOHAN BARTHOLD JONGKIND (1819-1891).

44 "View of Notre Dame, Paris" ... ... $16'' \times 21\frac{1}{2}''$
Lent by Mrs. F. J. Weldon.

PANEL VII.

EDOUARD MANET (1832—1883).

45 "Argenteuil" ... ... $23\frac{3}{4}'' \times 38\frac{3}{4}''$
Signed and dated, 1874.
Lent by Mr. Samuel Courtauld.

CLAUDE MONET.

46 "The Poppy Field" ... ... $36\frac{1}{2}'' \times 29''$

Signed and dated 1887. Exhibited at the Monet and Rodin Exhibition, Paris, 1889, No. 99. Exhibited at the Knoedler Galleries, London, 1923, No. 34. Mentioned in "Claude Monet" by Gustave Geffroy (Paris, 1922). From the Collection of the late Sir George A. Drummond, K.C.M.G., of Montreal.

Lent by Messrs. Knoedler & Co.

ALFRED SISLEY (1839—1899).

47 "Rue à Louveciennes" ... ... $17\frac{3}{4}'' \times 14\frac{5}{8}''$

Lent by Mr. F. Hindley Smith.

48 "Les chasseurs," ... ... $17'' \times 25''$

Signed and dated 1873. From the Viau Collection.

Lent by Mr. Percy Moore Turner.

EDGAR DEGAS (1834—1917).

49 "Le Café" ... ... $24\frac{1}{2}'' \times 20\frac{1}{2}''$

Exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club, "The French School of the last hundred years," 1922 (No. 35).

Lent by Mr. F. Hindley Smith.

WALTER SICKERT, A.R.A.

50 "The Balcony" ... ... $24\frac{1}{2}'' \times 29\frac{1}{2}''$

Lent by Sir Michael Sadler. C.B.

51 "The Trapeze" ... ... $25'' \times 31''$

Lent by Mr. F. Hindley Smith.

52 "Chicken"... ... ... $14'' \times 11\frac{1}{4}''$

Reproduced in "Sickert," 1919, plate V.

Lent by Mr. Percy Moore Turner.

Auguste Renoir

"La Loge"

(*No. 59 in Catalogue*)

WILSON STEER.

53 "Ludlow Bridge" ... ... $15\frac{1}{2}'' \times 23\frac{1}{2}''$

Lent by Mr. A. M. Daniel.

54 "Richmond, Yorkshire" ... ... $17\frac{1}{4}'' \times 23\frac{1}{4}''$

Lent by Sir Michael Sadler, C.B.

PANEL VIII.

GEORGES SEURAT (1859—1891).

55 "La Baignade" ... ... $5\frac{3}{4}'' \times 9\frac{1}{2}''$

Lent by Mr. Matthew L. Justice.

56 Oil Study for "La Baignade" (now in the National Gallery of British Art ... ... $6'' \times 9\frac{5}{8}''$

Lent by Mr. Samuel Courtauld.

57 Oil Study for "La Grande Jatte" (now in the Art Institute, Chicago) ... ... $6'' \times 9\frac{5}{8}''$

Exhibited at the Seurat Exhibition, Paris, 1909.

Lent by Mr. Percy Moore Turner.

PAUL SIGNAC

58 "Portrieux" (Opus 190), ... $22\frac{3}{4}'' \times 35\frac{1}{2}''$

Signed and dated, 1888

Lent by Mr. Percy Moore Turner.

PANEL IX.

AUGUSTE RENOIR (1841—1920)

59 "La Loge" (see illustration) ... ... $31\frac{1}{2}'' \times 25''$

Signed and dated 1874.

Portraits of the brother of Renoir and a model called Nini. Exhibited at the following Exhibitions :—

First Impressionist Exhibition at Nadar's, Paris, 1874, No. 142. Renoir Exhibition Galerie Durand-Ruel, Paris, 1892, No. 63. Exposition Centennale, Paris, 1900, No. 562, and reproduced on page 172.

Paul Cezanne

"La Montagne Sainte Victoire"

(*No. 63 in Catalogue*)

Exposition Secession de Vienne, Austria, 1903, No. 47.
Exposition Budapest, 1903, No. 42.
Exposition de La Libre Esthetique, Brussels, 1904, No. 128.
Exposition Grafton Galleries, London, 1905, No. 251 and reproduced on page 37.
Exposition Secession, Vienne, Austria, 1925, No. 60.

Reproduced in "La Revue d'art," Paris, 25th November, 1899.
„ "l'Art Decoratif," February, 1902. Article by Camille Mauclair. Reproduced on page 181.
„ "Kunst und Knustler," Berlin, April, 1906, an article by Th. Duret.
„ "Renoir et ses amis," by Riviere, Vol. 1, Paris, 1921, page 16.
„ "Duthuit—Renoir," Paris, 1923.
„ Meier—Graefe, Paris, 1912, page 45.
„ Renoir, published by Bernheim, Paris, 1913, reproduced in colours on page 4.

Lent by Mr. Samuel Courtauld.

60 "Le Printemps" ... ... $22\frac{3}{4}'' \times 28''$

Painted in 1875 and signed. Exhibited at the Burlington Fine Arts Club Exhibition of the French School of the last hundred years, 1922 (No. 37)

Lent by Mr. Percy Moore Turner.

61 "The Painter's Garden, Cagnes" ... ... $12\frac{1}{2}'' \times 17\frac{3}{4}''$

Lent by Mr. Wm. McInnes.

62 "Woman at her toilet" ... ... $19'' \times 21\frac{1}{4}''$

Lent by Mrs. Samuel Courtauld.

PANEL X.

Paul Cezanne (1839—1906).

63 "La Montagne Sainte Victoire" (see illustration) ... $25\frac{5}{8}'' \times 35\frac{1}{4}''$

This picture was given by Cezanne to M. Joachim Gasquet, the great provençal poet. Gasquet, who before his death wrote a book upon Cezanne, was one of his (Cezanne's) greatest friends, and for this reason Cezanne give him what he considered his finest picture.

Lent by Mrs. Samuel Courtauld.

VINCENT VAN GOGH (1853—1890)

64 " La charrue " ... ... 20" × 25¼"

Lent by Mr. William Boyd.

PAUL GAUGUIN (1848—1903).

65 " Paysage Exotique " ... ... 64" × 33¾"

Signed and dated 1887.

Lent by Mrs. R. A. Workman.

66 " L'esprit Veille " ... ... 27¼" × 35¼"

Signed and dated 1893. The title of this picture is also " Manao Tupapau " (Think of the Ghost), or The Spirits of the Dead are Watching.

Gauguin writes of it to Georges Daniel de Monfried on December 8th, 1892 :—

" This picture is for me (excellent) Here is the genesis (for you only) General Harmony. Dark dull violet, dark blue and chrome 1. The draperies are chrome 2, because this colour suggests night, without explaining it, however, and furthermore serves as a happy medium between the yellow orange and the green, completing the harmony. These flowers are also like phosphorescences in the night (in her thoughts). The Kankas believe that the phosphorous lights seen at night are the souls of the dead. In short, it is a fine bit of painting, although it is not according to nature."

Exhibited at First Exhibition of Post-Impressionist Painting, Grafton Galleries, 1910—1911. Exhibited at Exhibition of " A Hundred Years of French Art," The Louvre, Paris, 1925.

Lent by Sir Michael Sadler, C.B.

PANEL XI.

PIERRE BONNARD.

67 " Paysage " ... ... 28¾" × 24½"

Lent by the Right Hon. Lord Henry Bentinck, M.P.

68 " Le grand chapeau " ... ... 17¼" × 14¼"

Lent by Mr. F. Hindley Smith.

69 "Vue sur la Seine" ... ... 24" × 19½"
Lent by Mr. Wm. Boyd.

OTHON FRIESZ.

70 Portrait of Madame Friesz ... ... 28" × 22¾"
Lent by Mr. F. Hindley Smith.

JEAN MARCHAND.

71 "Montmartre" ... ... 28" × 35½"
Lent by Mr. Matthew L. Justice.

72 "Paysage de Vence" ... ... 23½" × 31¼"
Lent by Mr. Matthew L. Justice.

HENRI MATISSE.

73 "Antibes" ... ... 19½" × 23⅝"
Lent by Mr. Wm. Boyd.

74 "La Blouse Bulgare" ... ... 15¼" × 12¼"
Lent by Mr. F. Hindley Smith.

ANDRÉ DUNOYER DE SEGONZAC.

75 "La route à la ferme" ... ... 23" × 31"
Lent by Mr. F. Hindley Smith.

76 "Le Printemps" ... ... 34" × 44¾"
Salon d'automne 1920
Lent by Mrs. Percy Moore Turner.

JEAN EDOUARD VUILLARD.

77 "La maisonette Suisse" ... ... 15¼" × 23¼"
Lent by Mr. John Tattersall.

78 " Interior—La Mère et enfant " ... ... 19″ × 22⅛″

Lent by Mr. Wm. Boyd.

André Derain.

79 " Landscape—near Toulon " ... ... 21½″ × 20½″

Lent by the Right Hon. the Earl of Sandwich.

Duncan Grant.

80 " Sussex Landscape " ... ... 24¼″ × 29¼″

Lent by Mrs. Jowitt.

F. J. Porter.

81 " Arundel " ... ... 16¼″ × 20½″

Lent by Mr. F. Hindley Smith.

NOTES

on the Evolution of Painting from the Seventeenth Century to the present day.

PANEL I.

Sir Peter Paul Rubens	Born c. 1577	Died 1640
Claude Gellée (Lorrain)	„ 1600	„ 1682
Aelbert Cuyp	„ 1620	„ 1691
Jacob Isaaczen Ruisdael	„ 1628 or 1629	Died 1682
Meindert Hobbema	„ 1638	„ 1709

RUBENS was one of the geniuses responsible for the transference of the centre of gravity of painting from Italy to the North. He showed signs of creative ability from his earliest days, but his genius was brought to maturity by a long stay in Italy. There he evolved a style which for power and creative quality was unbeaten in his own day and has been rarely equalled. His later manner was founded on the Venetian masters, Giorgione, Titian, and Tintoretto ; their influence may be seen in the Rainbow Landscapes in the Wallace Collection and in the Munich gallery. Rubens was the master by whom Gainsborough and Constable were influenced in the formation of their later styles; to him Turner was greatly indebted, and so was the Frenchman Delacroix. The greatest contemporaries of Rubens were Claude Lorrain, Velasquez (1599—1660), and Rembrandt (1606—1669). It would have been interesting to have works of all three side by side with Rubens, but those most suitable for the purpose of the Spanish and Dutch masters being in national collections, cannot be borrowed. Characteristic examples however are shown in photographs—Rembrandt's " Skaters " in the Cassel Gallery, and Velazquez's " Boar Hunt " in the National Gallery, both of them paintings of the finest quality.

CLAUDE LORRAIN was another of the geniuses responsible for the diverting of the main stream of painting from Italy to Holland, Flanders, France, and England. And he was one of the first of those painters who, instead of treating landscape as a mere accessory in a picture, made it their principal object. For nobility of design and atmospheric qualities, Claude's landscapes have never been surpassed. Our own painters, Wilson, Gainsborough, Crome, Constable, and Turner, and the French, Corot, Sisley, and Cézanne, to mention but a few, are greatly indebted to him.

CUYP was one of the masters of the Dutch School who felt the influence of Claude in the treatment of atmosphere. In this sense he stands almost alone amongst his contemporary countrymen. The skill with which he treated light will always ensure him a high place amongst the comparatively early painters whose efforts were so greatly concerned with

that problem. It is highly probable that John Crome, in such examples as the "Early Dawn" shown in this Exhibition, was stirred to emulate Cuyp in this way.

Cuyp was a most versatile painter. In addition to landscapes he produced a number of extraordinarily interesting portraits and animal pictures. In landscape he described Nature in many phases and delighted to portray her charms under the golden glow or the summer sun, in the bleakness of winter, or even in the dead of night.

RUISDAEL is one of the corner stones of landscape painting. His landscapes are admirably planned and full of subtle truth; and, being of a highly poetical temperament, he infused them with a solemn grandeur. Unsurpassed by any contemporary work, they have been the foundation of much that came after. Among his best works are the beautiful view of Haarlem at the Hague, "The Cornfield" in Rotterdam, and the large and extensive landscape in the National Gallery. The early work of Gainsborough and Turner, much of the work of Crome, and much of that of Rousseau and Daubigny, show his influence.

HOBBEMA was a direct disciple of Ruisdael, but he is not of the same rank as his master. His creative power was much more limited, he was apparently incapable of dealing with the varied aspects of Nature, and treated one theme with but slight variations. He is at his best with wooded landscapes dotted with cottages and figures. In spite of his limitations, he has produced one of the great masterpieces of landscape painting, "The Avenue, Middelharnis," in the National Gallery. He greatly influenced John Crome, and that is a good reason for including him in this Exhibition.

PANEL II.

Antoine Watteau	Born 1683	Died 1721
Jean Baptiste Siméon Chardin	„ 1699	„ 1779
Jean Honoré Fragonard	„ 1732	„ 1806
William Hogarth	„ 1697	„ 1764
Richard Wilson	„ 1714	„ 1782
Sir Joshua Reynolds	„ 1723	„ 1792
Thomas Gainsborough	„ 1727	„ 1788

The diverting of the main stream of painting from Italy to the North led to a great outburst of artistic activity in the Low Countries; but the decay was surprisingly rapid, painters became hopelessly academic and devoted their attention exclusively to technique. That part of the stream which had been led to France by Claude Lorrain and Nicholas Poussin (1594—1565) did not produce such great effect as was produced in

the Low Countries, but the French artistic output was of high quality, and, though slower in its development, produced more lasting effects. Among those who were influenced by Claude and Poussin the three brothers Le Nain, Antoine (1588—1648), Louis (1593—1648), and Mathieu (1607—1677), hold a prominent place. But there was a group, the members of which, Le Brun (1619—1690) may be mentioned as an example, without absolutely outraging the principles imported from Italy by Claude and Poussin, devoted themselves largely to decoration and the baroque ; and it is tolerably clear that but for the influence of certain other painters of genius the outlook for French art would have been bad. The chief of these better painters were :—

WATTEAU went to Rubens for inspiration, and, in the course of his short life produced a series of paintings which not only augmented the best tradition in French art, but remain unrivalled for their lyrical and vivacious qualities. His subjects, which were drawn almost entirely from the frivolous but elegant aristocratic life of his time, are treated with much poetry and tenderness. Watteau's great contemporary was Chardin.

CHARDIN was a great painter who generally chose his subjects from a lower stratum of society than did Watteau. His outlook was broad, his treatment masculine in presentation, and his solid manner of painting, together with his beautiful sense of colour, raised him to the highest level of painting in the eighteenth century. French painting throughout the rest of that century was remarkable for its high technical achievement ; it reflected the gaiety and life of the nation.

Amongst the greatest artists of that time FRAGONARD occupies a most important place. His genius was brought ultimately to maturity by Rubens, either directly or through Watteau. His best work was done prior to the Revolution.

It is time to turn to the art of our own country, which, during the eighteenth century played a leading part in the evolution of painting. Before the eighteenth century, art had not greatly flourished on British soil. Van Dyck (1599—1641) was the first real stimulus ; then came Lely (1618—1860), and after him Kneller (1646—1723). The number of painters swelled considerably ; that they were nonentities is true, but they served to accustom the general public to art in the form of painting. Then came a golden age with a long line of geniuses.

HOGARTH was the first of these. He produced work, which for intensity and masculine vigour, has rarely been surpassed. He is purely English in style and outlook, but the influence of Rubens can be detected. Then came

RICHARD WILSON, another typically English genius and the father of English landscape. He it was who applied the maxims of Claude to English landscape, and so erected a style which has profoundly influenced the landscape art of the world. Next in order must be named

GAINSBOROUGH, celebrated both as a portrait and as a landscape painter. He was formed by Rubens through Van Dyck in so far as his portraits go; and to Rubens he owes his landscape style. He started, it is true, as a landscape painter with an intense admiration for the Dutch masters, especially for Ruisdael and Wynants, modified by the precepts of Richard Wilson, and under that influence he painted the "Cornard Wood" and the "Dedham," now in the National Gallery; but he soon passed from that style, and the first hand influence of Rubens became paramount. His great contemporary

SIR JOSHUA REYNOLDS moulded his genius on Rubens, and the Venetians formed his style as a portrait painter, and in that he takes a high place. He experimented all his life, but his experiments left his style unchanged. He and Gainsborough were the acknowledged leaders of the period. There were other competent painters, but none of the same rank.

PANEL III.

John Crome	Born 1768	Died 1821
John Constable	„ 1776	„ 1837
John Sell Cotman	„ 1782	„ 1842
Richard Parkes Bonington	„ 1802	„ 1828

Gainsborough died in 1788, Reynolds in 1792, and the French Revolution broke out in 1789; and that Revolution was highly detrimental to French art. To be assured of this it is only necessary to compare the pre-Revolution and post-Revolution work of such excellent painters as Fragonard and David. Fortunately, Britain was to a great extent untouched, and a small band of British landscape painters carried on their work, and to them France is indebted for her artistic recovery.

The first of this group is our Norfolk painter,

JOHN CROME, who began his artisitc life under the influence of Wilson, but later went for inspiration to Wynants, Ruisdael, Cuyp, and Hobbema. He produced work which, for vitality and poetical inspiration, equalled and sometimes surpassed that of the four great Dutch masters upon which his art was founded.

CONSTABLE the next in order, began by looking to Ruisdael, Wilson, and Gainsborough, but in the end came greatly under the influence of Rubens. He was the first nineteenth century revolutionary in painting; he brought about the downfall of the "brown tree" school. When, too, immediately after the revolution and its attendant wars had subsided, the French painters were looking for a lead, it was Constable who gave it them.

COTMAN is better known as a painter in water-colour than in oils, and the influences which affected him are more difficult to trace than is the case with many of his contemporaries. It can be safely assumed, however, that the Dutch had less to do with his development than was the case with Crome or even Constable. Such Dutch influence as there is in his art crept in second hand through Gainsborough. It was rather the Claudian tradition through John Robert Cozens and others which was responsible for his development; at a later date came the influence of Rubens. No doubt directly or indirectly he played a certain part in the development of the French school of 1830.

The short-lived BONINGTON played a most important role in the grafting of the English tradition upon French art at this vital period. His relations with Delacroix were most intimate, though whether it was Delacroix who influenced Bonington or Bonington who influenced Delacroix is one of the unsolved problems of art history.

PANEL IV.

Jean Baptiste Camille Corot	Born 1796	Died 1875
Jean François Millet	„ 1814	„ 1875
Charles François Daubigny	„ 1817	„ 1878
Pierre Etienne Théodore Rousseau ...	„ 1812	„ 1867

The school of 1830, or the Barbizon school, as it is alternately named, was a striking evidence of the recuperative powers of French art. The Barbizon group of painters, all of whom, however, did not work at Barbizon, was one of the first indications of the revival. Claude and Ruisdael, the one or the other predominating in individual cases, being the basis of their art, of which an intense love of natural beauty, coupled with poetical interpretation, was their characteristic. Rousseau and Daubigny were purely landscape painters. Millet and Corot were also figure painters; the former in many of his peasant scenes infused a remarkable amount of pathos, and in some cases the pathos was pushed beyond legitimate limits. Of this group Corot has been the one who has exercised the greatest influence upon the work of his successors; as time rolls on he is held in ever greater veneration.

PANEL V.

Jean Auguste Dominique Ingres	...	Born	1780	Died	1867
Ferdinand Victor Eugène Delacroix	...	„	1798	„	1863
Joseph Mallord William Turner...	...	„	1775	„	1851

The impulse towards classicism in art which followed the ending of the revolutionary period in France lasted for long. Classicism dominated the official art of France; for many years it had the field to itself. The later productions of David and Delaroche were in high favour; they and their successors were responsible for that avalanche of nauseating story-telling pictures which were the bane of European art in all countries during the greater part of the nineteenth century.

The classical movement, however, brought one great man, Ingres, into being. His draughtsmanship has many of the virtues of the great Florentine school, and he was not only the leader of the classical movement of the nineteenth century, but perhaps the only justification for its existence. Classicism did not, however, hold the field unchallenged. Another and opposite movement, Romanticism, vigorously opposed it. The real connecting link between Fragonard in his prime and the British School on the one hand and Romanticism on the other was Gericault. This remarkable painter worked under unsympathetic conditions and died young. He lived for a time in this country and absorbed the best principles of the British School. This influence, together with that of Rembrandt, brought Gericault's genius to maturity.

The real leader of Romanticism was Eugène Delacroix, who saw that Classicism was only a feeble travesty of the principles of the Renaissance, and that its Neo-classic art was hopelessly lacking in virility and dramatic quality. He turned to Rubens for inspiration, repeating for his generation what Watteau had done a century previously. Not only was Delacroix's attitude to art dramatically opposed to that of the classicists, but his technical methods were equally opposed; he broke up the surface of his painting in a way which his adversaries considered revolutionary. But the dramatic with Delacroix not infrequently became melodramatic. Had he not thus overstepped the mark, his place in art history would undoubtedly be much higher than it is.

Alongside Delacroix we must place our own great English painter, J. M. W. TURNER, whose early career as a painter was built upon Claude and Ruisdael. Later he became engrossed with many of the problems which were intriguing Delacroix, chief amongst which was that of the relation of light to natural objects. Whether they ever met is not known, but Turner was frequently in Paris, and it is highly probable, considering the eminence of the two men, and their kindred outlook in many ways on art, that they did come into contact with one another. Jointly, they influenced the art of their century greatly; they paved the way for the Impressionist movement of a later time.

PANEL VI.

Gustave Courbet	Born 1819	Died 1877
Honoré Daumier	„ 1808	„ 1899
Johan Barthold Jongkind	„ 1819	„ 1891

The outburst of Romanticism which Delacroix and Turner brought about was of such virulence that there was danger that in over-emphasising the dramatic, other qualities quite as essential would be neglected. Romanticism, for example, was hardly concerned with the texture or relative densities of natural objects. A partial reaction, or at least a steadying factor, was bound sooner or later to manifest itself.

COURBET was the painter who brought the artists back to earth, and with him there was DAUMIER, one of the greatest figures of modern painting. In these two men we find the first indication of Rembrandt's influence definitely moulding art. Hitherto Rubens had held sway, the influence of Rembrandt occurring but spasmodically; from the time of Courbet and Daumier, however, Rembrandt's influence became more and more powerful. It was the Dutchman, JONGKIND, who carried the principles of Rembrandt and the other outstanding Dutch landscapists to France, and, becoming absorbed in the French school, successfully grafted the Dutch tradition on the art of his adopted country.

PANEL VII.

Edouard Manet	Born 1833	Died 1883
Alfred Sisley	„ 1839	„ 1899
Edgar Degas	„ 1834	„ 1917
Claude Monet	Living	
Walter Sickert	„	
Wilson Steer	„	
Augustus John	„	

We are now approaching the middle of the nineteenth century, and are consequently upon the threshold of a movement—Impressionism—which was destined to materially influence painting. Impressionism was the work of a handful of men, who crystallized the experiments of Turner and Delacroix and translated their results into a theoretical formula. Impressionism in practice broadly resolves itself into an endeavour to represent the general effect of a scene as it strikes the eye, suppressing local detail and colour, whilst retaining the architectural structure of the whole, that is to say, the design. It was the first time in the history of painting that an attempt had been consciously made to harmonize science and art. The impressionist movement as a creative force, supremely important as it was, soon spent intself. Perhaps its greatest exponent was SISLEY, an artist of English stock but French by birth.

MONET, PISSARRO, and RENOIR, however, were enormously important in a similar respect.

What had become of British art during this fairly long stretch of time may well be asked at this juncture. Britain, which had held the supremacy during the closing years of the eighteenth and the first decade of the nineteenth century, must surely have had much to say during this period? But, in fact, from the death of Turner in 1851 Britain had no part in the evolution of painting.

It was only towards the end of the nineteenth century that a band of young British painters realised that France was leading the world and that Britain was no longer of any account. Such art as we had was hopelessly academic, smug and commonplace, and soaked through and through with story-telling sentimentality. These men, who are happily almost all still with us, raised the standard of revolt and brought the New English Art Club into being. Able painters, understanding the function of their art, and supported by criticism of such an intellectual calibre that the entrenched academic art of that time could not approach. After a dogged fight extending over many a year, they effected an almost complete transformation in British art, and made possible the movements which have subsequently arisen.

DEGAS that great master of line, lived alongside the French impressionists, but was not of their number. He was the chief source of inspiration so far as the "New English" movement went. His influence was transferred to England through Whistler, whose art can best be explained by connecting him with Degas and with Japan. Another and somewhat younger man greatly helped to affect England with the spirit of Degas's art.

This was WALTER SICKERT, A.R.A., who shrewdly reinterpreted the art of Degas and enriched it with all he had acquired through a close and sympathetic study of and friendship with his master, Whistler. Two more English painters, who, like Sickert, still continue to delight us with their creations are WILSON STEER and Henry Tonks. The former's influence has been very great and perhaps no living artist has done more to convince the younger generation that Impressionism can still be exploited with advantage.

PANEL VIII.

Georges Seurat	Born 1859	Died 1891
Paul Signac	Living	

There existed in the Impressionist body certain painters who were particularly determined to stand dogmatically for the pure Impressionist creed. Hence came a partial schism. These purists were Seurat, Signac, Cross, and a few others. Like their colleagues, they restricted themselves

to the use of " pure colours." But they disagreed with the mixing of these colours on the canvas as the great bulk of the Impressionists were wont to to. They placed the colours in their pure form in dots or " points " on the canvas, leaving them to fuse when seen from a sufficient distance. This new group, which called itself the Neo-Impressionist group, later came to be known as the " Pointillists," from the method they employed. They claimed that they had made a considerable advance upon the Impressionist method, by giving a truer rendering of the effect of light upon natural objects than was possible by employing the less logical Impressionist formula.

The short-lived SEURAT, whilst not always strictly adhering to Neo-Impressionist principles, produced a number of masterpieces which are influencing profoundly the younger generation of painters. He produced very few works of large dimensions; one of the finest, the celebrated " Baignade," is, thanks to a private donor, now in the Tate Gallery. All his works, large and small, are remarkable for their impeccable composition and tenderness of presentation.

PANEL IX.

Auguste Renoir. ... ... Born 1841 Died 1920

Amongst the Impressionist painters it is almost needless to say that RENOIR occupies a most important place. He accepted the whole of the impressionist doctrine and produced a series of compositions, portraits, and landscapes, which, it is scarcely going too far to say, rank amongst the world's masterpieces. In one way they differ from pure Impressionism as practised by Sisley and Monet. They were content to treat a plane more or less as a flat surface and introduced little or no modulations upon it to indicate shadow or rotundity, so being purely two dimensional painters. Renoir differed from them in this respect; he maintained that the portraying of the modulations of shadow upon a plane was an essential function of painting. He was a three-dimensional painter, and so the connecting link between Impressionists and Post-Impressionists. Renoir is one of the most complete artists of the nineteenth century. He is as complete, without in any way comparing him with them, as Rubens and Rembrandt. It is therefore improbable that his full influence on painting will be manifest for generations to come. His work may be roughly divided into three periods, of all of which we have outstanding examples in the present exhibition. The first from 1870—1880; the second from 1880—1900; and the last from 1900 to his death in 1917. Of the first period we have two outstanding masterpieces, the sumptuous " Loge " and " Le Printemps "; of his intermediate style two beautiful landscapes; and, finally, of his last manner, the exquisite " Woman Dressing."

PANEL X.

Paul Cézanne	Born 1839	Died 1906
Vincent Van Gogh	„ 1853	„ 1890
Paul Gauguin	„ 1848	„ 1903

The possibilities and limits of Impressionism were thoroughly explored and exploited by its originators. Art had been led into a cul-de-sac, but the emergency produced the man, Paul Cézanne.

CÉZANNE began by being a pure Impressionist, but the time came when he perceived the barrenness of the impressionist formula, and saw that art was being dragged at the heels of science, and that there was danger that the emotional qualities would be submerged. In returning to tradition, Cézanne, through his art, maintained, that Impressionism, in seeking to portray a scene as it strikes the eye without undue attention to local detail and colour and employing for its presentation the scientific discoveries of the analysis and synthesis of white light, was in imminent danger of making art subservient to science. Art, he maintained, being concerned purely with aesthetics and emotions, should not be unduly concerned with such concrete scientific representation. It was far more important—nay, vital—that an artist should seek to transmit to a responsive person the emotions which he had experienced from the contemplation of a scene. The difference between Impressionism and the attitude of Cézanne may upon first sight appear trifling, but when the two are weighed from a purely aesthetic point of view, the divergence is seen to be fundamental. As has been intimated, Cézanne was not in any sense a revolutionary. He was a strict traditionalist. His gods were Rembrandt and El Greco, Poussin and Claude, Corot and Constable, and his career was one long logical development, culminating in the masterpieces of the last twenty years of his life. In the fine " Montagne Ste Victoire " we have one of his greatest masterpieces, a creation for which he executed a large number of preliminary studies in oil and water-colours.

Cézanne had two great contemporaries, Vincent Van Gogh and Paul Gauguin. It is noticeable that the Dutch tradition has twice been successfully grafted upon French art—once by Jongkind and again by Bab Gogh. The former's relation to French Impressionism is definitely established. VAN GOGH'S influence upon French art has yet to be determined. His early works are conceived and carried out in the spirit of the nineteenth century Dutch painters ; it was only when he came to Paris that his genius was matured. He carried the doctrine of Impressionism to its extreme limits. The neo-impressionist technicque of Seurat and Signac appealed irresistibly to him, and his latest and finest works were executed in their manner.

PAUL GAUGUIN was a curious phenomenon. Of pure French extraction on his father's side, his mother was a Creole. Destined for the Paris Stock Exchange, his career was deflected by meeting Pissarro, who instilled into him the principles of Impressionism. He deserted the Stock Exchange and became a painter. Hating urban life, and loving the earth

for its own sake, he shook the dust of Paris from off his feet and went to Brittany; there his theories with regard to the peasants were soon to receive a severe shock, and then he decided that Europe being debased and decadent, salvation must be sought amongst unsophisticated savages or semi-savages. He went to Martinque and instantly came under the spell of its exotic conditions. He was, however, without resources, and to provide means of existence he sent the pictures he painted to Paris, where they had a very discouraging reception. He returned to Paris; then again he tried Brittany, but only to experience the same disillusions; finally despairing and enraged, he went off to Tahiti, and there lived for the remainder of his life. His art has a bizarre flavour, his curious decoration having an exotic quality that no other painter possesses. With Puvis de Chavannes he grasped the principles of decoration as no other painters have done since the golden period of Italian art.

PANEL XI.

Pierre Bonnard
André Derain
Othon Friesz
Duncan Grant
Jean Marchand
Henri Matisse
Frederic Porter
André Dunoyer de Segonzac
Jean Edouard Vuillard

Of all the painters of recent years, Cézanne has undoubtedly exercised the greatest influence internationally. His work is not only a new point of departure in painting, but, further, as an end in itself, it can scarcely be over-rated, and it opened new vistas to the rising generation of painters.

We must pass over the first and short-lived Cubist movement, important as it was in the history of modern painting, for, unfortunately, there are no worthy examples in this country. And we can ignore Futurism, for, in spite of certain adherents of its violent creed claiming parentage with Cézanne, it was but a form of pictorialism closely related with the banalities of the Victorian era cloaked in abstract form. The real movement emanating from Cézanne assumed various phases. There was the lyrical phase, exemplified by MATISSE in France and DUNCAN GRANT in England. Then we have the analytical phase of which the great exponent is FRIESZ. Lastly, but not the least important, is the synthetic phase represented by ANDRÉ DUNOYER DE SEGONZAC and JEAN MARCHAND in France and FREDERICK PORTER in England. VUILLARD and BONNARD are most important connecting links between Impressionism and Post-Impressionism. In reality, Impressionists have been profoundly influenced by the Post-Impressionists' art of their time.

The so-called modern art movement has given birth to a large number of painters—good, bad, and indifferent. In this respect it does not differ materially from any of its predecessors. But the formula emanating from Cézanne has this danger, as far as the general public, and, dare it be said, the intelligentia is concerned ; never before was there a movement which placed an instrument of technique in the hands of charlatans so potent of deception as is that of the Post-Impressionists. Any generation can congratulate itself which hands down to posterity half a dozen painters who are not only vital to their period and expressive of it, but also form an integral part of the main stream of art ; but the number of painters who have adopted the post-impressionist formula, sometimes quite genuinely, sometimes, alas, from a desire to be topical and fashionable, is legion.

This brings us to the latest movement in modern art. Up to the moment of writing no fresh development has come into being. We still have to-day in England an enormous number of academic painters, but the spirit of the post-war art lover has set against them, and they enjoy in England, and in England only, a declining patronage. Some Impressionists, as we have indicated above, are happily still with us, and more than one of them are represented by names honoured at home and famous throughout the world. The younger painters can, for the most part, be described as Post-Impressionists. Cubist and abstract art in general has suffered a rapid decline, and not more than two or three abstract painters still survive in England. It would be foolish, of course, to over-estimate the significance of this. The setting of the tide against abstract art may very well mean the birth of a new era. The waters are troubled, but history clearly teaches us that that is on the whole a good sign. Stagnation only is to be feared ; and we look forward with confident eyes to the future.

PERCY MOORE TURNER.

ARTISTS.

	Catalogue No.
Bonington, Richard Parkes	30
Bonnard, Pierre	67, 68, 69
Cezanne, Paul	63
Chardin, Jean Baptiste Simeon	8, 9
Claude Lorrain	1
Constable, John	27, 28, 29
Corot, Jean Baptiste Camille	31, 32, 33
Cotman, John Sell	24, 25, 26
Courbet, Gustave	42
Crome, John	19, 20, 21, 22, 23
Cuyp, Aelbert	6
Daubigny, Charles Francois	35, 36
Daumier, Honore	43
Degas, Edgar	49
Delacroix, Eugene	39
Derain, Andre	79
Fragonard, Jean Honore	10
Friesz, Othon	70
Gainsborough, Thomas	14, 15, 16, 17
Gauguin, Paul	65, 66
Grant, Duncan	80
Hobbema, Meindert	2
Hogarth, William	11
Ingres, Jean Auguste Dominique	38
Jongkind Johan B.	44

ARTISTS—*continued.*

	Catalogue No.
Manet, Edouart	45
Marchand, Jean	71, 72
Matisse, Henri	73, 74
Millet, Jean Francois	34
Monet, Claude	46
Porter, F. J.	81
Renoir, Auguste	59, 60, 61, 62
Reynolds, Sir Joshua	18
Rousseau, Pierre Etienne Theodore	37
Rubens, Sir Peter Paul	4, 5
Ruisdael, Jacob Isaaczon Van	3
Segonzac, Andre Dunoyer de	75, 76
Seurat, Georges Pierre	55, 56, 57
Sickert, Walter	50, 51, 52
Signac, Paul	58
Sisley, Alfred	47, 48
Steer, Wilson	53, 54
Turner, Joseph Mallord William	40, 41
Van Gogh, Vincent	64
Vuillard, Edouard	77, 78
Watteau, Antoine	7
Wilson, Richard	12, 13

OWNERS OF PICTURES.

	Catalogue No.
Bentinck, Lord Henry	67
Bernheim-Jeune, M.	39
Boyd, William 64,	69, 73, 78
Bute, the Marquess of	2
Christie, J. A., M.P.	26
Colman, Russell J. 21,	22, 23, 24
Courtauld, Samuel 45,	56, 59
Courtauld, Mrs. Samuel	62, 63
Daniel, A. M.	53
Falk, Oswald T.	38
Ford, Captain Richard	12
Glasgow, Kelvingrove Art Galleries	34
Glasgow, University Court of	8
Glenconner, Lord	30
Hockliffe, E.	40
Holmes, Sir Charles	28
Jowitt, Mrs.	80
Justice, Matthew L. 55,	71, 72
Knoedler & Co., Messrs.	46
Leicester, the Earl of 1,	14, 18
Lewis, E. A.	13, 16
Louvre, Paris	10
Maitland, Mr. and Mrs. Alexander	42
McInnes, William	61

OWNERS OF PICTURES—*continued*

	Catalogue No.
National Gallery, Trustees of	5, 6
National Gallery of British Art, Trustees of ...	25, 29, 41
Nutman, John R.	19
Reyre, A. F.	3
Rienaecker, Victor	17, 20, 31, 33, 35, 37
Sadler, Sir Michael	27, 43, 50, 54, 66
Sandwich, the Earl of	11, 79
Smith, F. Hindley ...	15, 47, 49, 51, 68, 70, 74, 75, 81
Sykes, S. W.	32
Tattersall, John	77
Turner, Percy Moore	4, 36, 48, 52, 57, 58, 60
Turner, Mrs. Percy Moore	76
Weldon, Mrs. F. J.	7, 9, 44
Workman, Mrs. R. A.	65

Printed and Published by
Messrs. A. E. Soman & Co.
St. Andrews Printing Works
Norwich